

**FIRE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
CONCURRENTLY WITH
THE SPECIAL OCCUPANCY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
TELECONFERENCE MEETING FROM TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA
WEB URL [HTTPS://GLOBAL.GOTOMEETING.COM/JOIN/807096829](https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/807096829)**

**AUDIO: DIAL-IN NUMBER 1 877 568 4106
CONFERENCE CODE/MEETING ID: 807-096-829**

**December 2, 2016
1:00 PM until completion**

FIRE TAC PRESENT:

Tony Apfelbeck
Charlie Frank
Robert Hamberger
Brad Schiffer

Joe Belcher
Jeff Gross
Joe Holland
Peter Schwab

FIRE TAC NOT PRESENT:

Hamid Bahadori, Chairman

Jim Schock

STAFF PRESENT:

Mo Madani
April Hammonds
Robert Benbow
Marlita Peters
Jim Hammers

Thomas Campbell
Nick DuVal
Chris Howell
Norman Bellamy

Welcome:

Time: 1:00 p.m.

Ms. Peters welcomed everyone to the concurrent teleconference call of the Fire Technical Advisory Committee. She provided information for the callers on how to mute systems to avoid background noise.

Roll Call:

Ms. Peters performed roll call for the Fire TAC. A quorum was determined with 7 members present at roll call with Mr. Hamberger joining after roll call and the first two actions for a total of 8 members present on the call.

Agenda Approval:

Mr. Belcher entered a motion to approve the agenda for today's meeting as posted. Mr. Apfelbeck seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with a vote of 7 to 0.

Review and Approval of July 15, 2016 meeting minutes:

Mr. Apfelbeck entered a motion to approve the minutes from the July 15 2016 meetings as posted. Mr. Belcher seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with a vote of 7 to 0.

To Consider and discuss the following Declaratory Statements:

DS 2016-080 by Tom Files of Feasterco Construction, Inc.

There was no one on the line representing the petitioner.

Mr. Madani provided the background on the declaratory statement.

Question:

Can an NFPA 13R system be used in a transient lodging facility with interior corridors that meets all applicable criteria of Chapter 5 of the F.B.C. 2014 addition allowing it to be protected under 903.3.1.2 NFPA 13R?

Option #1/Petitioner:

Petitioner respectfully believes the answer is "Yes". If the answer were "No" than why would the criteria and allowable exceptions as listed in Chapter V be outlined as they are. The use of Chapter 5 criteria saves a great expense on this particular type of commercial project and seems to meet the intent of the NFPA 13R and Florida Building Code for the building and occupancy type.

Option #2/Staff:

“Yes”, as per Section 903.3.1.2 of the 5th Edition (2014) Florida Building Code (FBC), Building, an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with NFPA 13R is permitted to be used in the transient lodging facility in question for the purpose of demonstrating compliance with Section 461.1 of the 5th Edition (2014) FBC, Building.

Mr. Apfelbeck entered a motion to recommend Option 2 staff response to the question. Mr. Holland seconded the motion.

Discussion followed among the TAC members regarding statutory language in Section 461.1.

The motion passed unanimously with a vote of 7 to 0.

DS 2016 – 082 by Chris Glover of Palmwood Construction; James Friedrichs of Hernando County Building Division; and Douglas Buck of the Florida Home Builders Association

Mr. Belcher recused himself from voting as he prepared the questions on this declaratory statement for the petitioner.

Mr. Glover and Mr. Buck were both present on the call.

Mr. Belcher provided a summary of the declaratory statement.

Mr. Madani provided a summary of the staff analysis.

Question:

With the understanding the project will be protected by a fire sprinkler system per Florida Building Code-Building, 5th Edition (2014), §903.2.8.1, do the provisions of Chapter 419 Florida Statute which classifies the project as a single-family non-commercial unit supersede or prevail over the provisions of the Florida Building Code, 5th Edition (2014) permitting construction under the Florida Building Code-Residential because Florida Statute already defines the facility as a single-family non-commercial unit?

Answer:

Option #1/Petitioner: The Petitioners seek an interpretation that residential community homes of six or fewer residents licensed under Chapter 419 Florida Statute while an R-4 occupancy class may be constructed as a single-family unit under the Florida Building Code – Residential, 5th Edition (2014) in concert with the intent of Chapter 419 Florida Statute. The construction will include the installation of a fire sprinkler system complying with Florida Building Code-Building Section 903.2.8.1.

Option #2/Staff: Considering the facts that the project in question is a community residential home “R-4 occupancy” with six or fewer residents licensed under 419 Florida Statutes and that the said project will be protected by a fire sprinkler system as per Section 903.2.8.1 of the 5th Edition (2014) Florida Building Code, Building, the answer is that the project in question may be permitted for construction under the 5th Edition (2014) Florida Building Code, Residential.

Discussion followed among the TAC.

Ms. Hammonds addressed the discussion on Chapter 419 stating that this Commission has no jurisdiction on this Chapter.

Discussion continued among the members.

Mr. Schiffer entered a motion to recommend Option 2 staff response to the question. Mr. Holland seconded the motion.

A roll call vote was taken.

Mr. Schwab	Yes	Mr. Belcher	Recused
Mr. Gross	Yes	Mr. Hamberger	Yes
Mr. Schiffer	Yes	Mr. Holland	Yes
Mr. Apfelbeck	Yes		

The motion passed with a vote of 7 to 0 with the Mr. Belcher recused.

DS 2016 - 081 by Alan Gremillion of GL Homes and Douglas Buck of the Florida Home Builders Association

Mr. Belcher recused himself from voting as he prepared the questions on this declaratory statement for the petitioner.

Mr. Gremillion was present on the call.

Mr. Belcher provided a summary of the declaratory statement.

Mr. Madani provided a summary of the staff analysis.

Question 1

Does the definition of Fire Separation Distance Item 4 apply to an attached single-family dwelling separated by a property line?

Answer:

Option #1/Petitioner: No.

Option #2/Staff: No. Item 4 of the definition of “Fires Separation Distance” of Section R202 of the 5th Edition (2014) Florida Building Code, Residential is more applicable to zero lot line development.

Question 2

Does Exception 7 to FBC-R 5th Edition (2014), Section R302.1 Exterior Walls apply to an attached single-family dwelling separated by a property line?

Answer:

Option #1/Petitioner: No.

Option #2/Staff: No. Section R302.1 (Exception 7) of the 5th Edition (2014) Florida Building Code, Residential is more applicable to zero lot line development.

Question 3 If the answers to Questions 1 and 2 are no, do the fire separation provisions of Table R302.1 (1) prevail?

Answer:

Option #1/Petitioner: Yes.

Option #2/Staff: Yes. The fire separation provisions of Table R302.1 (1) of the 5th Edition (2014) Florida Building Code, Residential do apply to the project in question.

Question 4 Does the definition of the term “townhouse” of Ch. 481.203(7), F.S; prevail over the definition of the term “townhouse” of the FBC-R, 5th Edition (2014)?

Answer:

Option #1/Petitioner: Yes.

Option #2/Staff: Answer is not possible as the Commission has no authority to interpret Section 481.203(7), Florida Statute.

Question 5

May an attached single-family dwelling consisting of two dwelling units separated by a property line be designed and constructed in accordance with the FBCR. 5th Edition (2014), provisions for “townhouses”? (FBC-R, 5th Ed, §R302.2)

Answer:

Option #1/Petitioner: Yes.

Option #2/Staff: No. Based on the definition of the term “Townhouse” [see Section R202 Definition of the 5th Edition (2014) Florida Building Code (FBC), Residential], the project in question cannot be classified as townhouses and therefore it cannot be designed and constructed in accordance with Section R302.2 of the 5th Edition (2014) FBC, Residential.

Discussion followed among the TAC.

Mr. Apfelbeck entered a motion to recommend Option 2 staff response for questions 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. Mr. Holland seconded the motion.

Extensive discussion followed among the TAC. There was further discussion on a possible amendment.

Mr. Frank called to order and asked for the motion vote.

Since Mr. Frank of the TAC called to order and the motion has a second there was a roll call vote taken.

Mr. Schwab	Yes	Mr. Belcher	Recused
Mr. Gross	Yes	Mr. Hamberger	Yes
Mr. Schiffer	Yes	Mr. Holland	Yes
Mr. Apfelbeck	Yes		

The motion passed with a vote of 7 to 0 with the Mr. Belcher recused.

DS 2016-078 by Joseph Hauf of Conquest Firespray. LLC

Mr. Hauf was present on the call and provided a summary of his request for declaratory statement.

Mr. Madani provided a summary of the staff analysis.

Part One:

Question:

Is it the requirement of the Code that symmetry testing is required by Section 703 .2.1 for this vertical riser application, as referenced by the above Code Paths, whether the vertical riser application is satisfied by built assemblies or listed products?

Answer:

Option #1/Petitioner: Petitioner respectfully believes the answers to these questions are “YES.” To be a compliant design option for each of these project applications, a fire rated assembly must be tested to the same standard of care, regardless of whether it is a “built” shaft wall assembly or listed product. This is because either assembly performs exactly the same function within the building, as far as the Code is concerned. A listed product assembly is no different with respect to the fire exposures to which it must perform, just as the “built” assembly is required to perform. Many options may be available to address the same problem, but **all** options must demonstrate compliance with the risks assigned by the Code. So, any non-symmetrical fire rated assembly must demonstrate that it is capable of performing for the required hourly rating for both **inside** and **outside** fire exposures. The only exceptions are: - for exterior walls, which rely upon setbacks (Note: none of the above project applications are for exterior walls), or - for assemblies where the non-symmetrical assembly has clearly been tested on its weakest exposure (Note: none of the considered products/assemblies have any evidence of testing which might establish that a single fire exposure test was for the weakest assembly exposure).

There is no exception to symmetry requirements for fire resistive testing, as defined by Section 703.2.1, whether the protected duct serves supply air, exhaust air, return air or otherwise. Symmetry testing applies in all referenced applications, regardless. The Petitioner understands that fire resistance protection of ventilation ducts is not always checked for compliance with symmetry testing in accordance with Section 703.2.1, even when the Code Paths described herein lead to this requirement. Petitioner believes that for each of the applications described above for this project, this situation is capable of being reconciled by a clear expression of the Commission as to the requirement of the Code relative to symmetry testing, regardless of the mode of construction, whether by prescriptive compliance, by calculated compliance, or by use of listed products tested by Approved Agencies.

Option #2/Staff: The product in question “a **vertical riser duct is specified for fire resistive protection**” is a proposed alternative to the prescribed shaft enclosure as specified in Sections 707.3.1 and 713.4 of the Florida Building Code “FBC”, Building. As per Sections 104.11 and 703.3 of the Florida Building Code, Building, an alternative method of construction to that prescribed in the FBC is subject to review and approval by the local building official, when such alternative is substantiated to be equivalent of that prescribed in the FBC in quality, strength, effectiveness, durability and safety.

Part Two:

Question:

Is it the requirement of the Code that symmetry testing is required by Section 703.2.1 for this application, as referenced by the above Code Paths, whether the elevator shaft pressurization application is satisfied by built assemblies or listed products?

Answer:

Option #1/Petitioner: Petitioner respectfully believes the answers to these questions are “YES.”

Note: for more clarification with regard to the Petitioner’s answer, please see answer to “Part One” above.

Option #2/Staff: The product in question “**a duct is specified for fire resistive protection**” is a proposed alternative to the prescribed elevator shaft pressurization application as specified in Sections 713.14 and 909.21.3 of the Florida Building Code “FBC”, Building. As per Sections 104.11 and 703.3 of the Florida Building Code, Building, an alternative method of construction to that prescribed in the FBC is subject to review and approval by the local building official, when such alternative is substantiated to be equivalent of that prescribed in the FBC in quality, strength, effectiveness, durability and safety.

Part Three:

Question:

Is it the requirement of the Code that symmetry testing is required by Section 703.2.1 for this application, as referenced by the above Code Paths, whether the smokeproof enclosure ventilation application is satisfied by built assemblies or listed products?

Answer:

Option #1/Petitioner: Petitioner respectfully believes the answers to these questions are “YES.”

Note: for more clarification with regard to the Petitioner’s answer, please see answer to “Part One” above.

Option #2/Staff: The product in question “**a duct is specified for fire resistive protection**” is a proposed alternative to the prescribed smoke proof enclosure ventilation application as specified in Sections 909.20.2, 707.3.2, 707.3.3, 707.3.4, 1009.2.2, 1009.3.1.2, 1022.1, 1022.2, 1022.6, and 1023.3 of the Florida Building Code “FBC”, Building. As per Sections 104.11 and 703.3 of the Florida Building Code, Building, an alternative method of construction to that prescribed in the FBC is subject to review and approval by the local building official, when such alternative is substantiated to be equivalent of that prescribed in the FBC in quality, strength, effectiveness, durability and safety.

Part Four:

Question:

Is it the requirement of the Code that symmetry testing is required by Section 703 .2.1 for this application, as referenced by the above Code Paths, whether the stairwell pressurization application is satisfied by built assemblies or listed products?

Answer:

Option #1/Petitioner: Petitioner respectfully believes the answers to these questions are “YES.”

Note: for more clarification with regard to the Petitioner’s answer, please see answer to “Part One” above.

Option #2/Staff: The product in question “**a duct is specified for fire resistive protection**” is a proposed alternative to the prescribed stairwell pressurization application as specified in Section 909.20.6.1 of the Florida Building Code “FBC”, Building. As per Sections 104.11 and 703.3 of the Florida Building Code, Building, an alternative method of construction to that prescribed in the FBC is subject to review and approval by the local building official, when such alternative is substantiated to be equivalent of that prescribed in the FBC in quality, strength, effectiveness, durability and safety.

Discussion followed among the TAC. There were some specific questions asked that were addressed by Mr. Hauf.

Mr. Belcher entered a motion to recommend Option 2 for all four questions with added language “where this alternate is approved by the local building official, the offsets are required to be tested from both sides” to all four answers. Mr. Apfelbeck seconded the motion.

Mr. Schwab	Yes	Mr. Belcher	Yes
Mr. Gross	Yes	Mr. Hamberger	Yes
Mr. Schiffer	Yes	Mr. Holland	No
Mr. Apfelbeck	Yes		

The motion passed with a vote of 7 in favor and 1 vote against.

There was no further TAC business.

Final Roll Call performed and all 8 members remained on the line.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:55p.m.